

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES**

**FILED**

2007 NOV 27 PM 1:11

TO: ☐ U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE / ☒ U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
 FROM: R. Mullin, Deputy Clerk  
 CASE NO.: 07cv2183 DMS (RBB) DOCUMENT FILED BY: Petitioner  
 CASE TITLE: Cunningham v. Marshall  
 DOCUMENT ENTITLED: Motion for Stay and Abeyance

CLERK US DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RECEIVED DATE: 11/16/2007

Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Rule	Discrepancy
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.4	<b>Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1	Missing table of contents
<input type="checkbox"/> 15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself
<input type="checkbox"/> 30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order
<input type="checkbox"/>	Supplemental documents require court order
<input type="checkbox"/>	Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	<b><u>OTHER: Document already on file (Docket #3).</u></b>

Date forwarded: 11/16/2007

**ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

- ☐ The document is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.
- ☒ The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties.

Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate? ☐ Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers ☐

Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83.1

CHAMBERS OF: DMS

Dated: 11-27-07  
 cc: All Parties

By: [Signature]

JAMES H CUNNINGHAM III

CALIFORNIA MEN'S COLONY State Prison

P.O. BOX 8101 (62)

SAN LUIS OBISPO, CA. 95409-8101

IN PRO PER

REJECTED

UNITED STATES District Court

SOUTHERN District of CALIFORNIA

JAMES CUNNINGHAM  
Petitioner,

v.

John Marshall (Warden CMC)  
Respondent

MOTION for STAY AND ABEYANCE  
of FEDERAL Habeas Corpus  
Petition To Exhaust Additional  
UNEXHAUSTED Claims in  
The State Courts.

Petitioner, JAMES CUNNINGHAM in proper, respectfully moves this Honorable Court for a stay and abeyance of his Federal habeas Petition, while Petitioner goes back to the State Court to exhaust additional UNEXHAUSTED Claims that were not included in the Petition in wake of The U.S. Supreme Court recent decision in - RHINES V. WEBER 2005 124 S.Ct. 1528.

This motion is based on the facts and memorandum of authorities stating why the District court should grant the petitioners stay and abeyance.